

*The Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost prov'd
from Scripture, and the Ante-Nicene Fathers.*

4

17953

A

S E R M O N

Preach'd before the

University of Oxford,

At St. M A R Y's,

On St. MATTHIAS-DAY, Feb. 24th 1716₇

*In which also Monf. Le-Clerc's Charge on the Fathers,
as holding the Unity of the Divine Essence to be a
Specificical one, is shown to be groundless.*

By WILLIAM STEPHENS, M. A.
Late Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford.

Publish'd at the Request of Mr. Vice-Chancellor.

Πάντων ἢ ὑψηλότερον, τῆς μὲν βλασφημίας ἢ Προϋμα-
τίας ἀνέκδοτος ὡς τὸν ἀσινῶ λόγον ἀποθεστέον. Ἡμεῖς
ἡ παλαιότερη ἔχοντες συναγωγὴν εἰς συνέχον, (Προϋμα πιν.
8μοῦ) ἐκνοῶν τὸν λόγον διακονοῦν, ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἱ. Πατρῶν
συμβολῆς ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀκολουθία μὴ μὴ διασπασίᾳ.
Basil. de Sp. Sanct. cap. 30. p. 365.

The Third Edition.

OXFORD,

Printed by L. Lichfield, for Sam. Wilmer, Bookseller: And are
to be Sold by J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, W. and J. Innes, in St.
Paul's, and J. Roberts, in Warwick-Lane, London. 1725.

Price Six-Pence.

Printed and Published by the High Church Press
in the Strand, near the Anne-Nichols Passage.

STEPHENSON

Imprimatur,

JO. BARON

Vice-Can. OXON

July 18. 1717.

By WILLIAM STEPHENS, M.A.
Late Fellow of Exeter College in Oxford.
Published at the Request of Mr. A. C. C.

Printed by J. Sturges, at the High Church Press, in the Strand, near the Anne-Nichols Passage.

Printed by J. Sturges, at the High Church Press, in the Strand, near the Anne-Nichols Passage.

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in God

LANCELOT,

Lord Bishop of

EXETER:

To The Reverend

Mr. *Edward Trelawny*, Dean:

And To

The Reverend the

CANONS of that CHURCH:

This DISCOURSE is

With all Humility and Gratitude

Dedicated by

THE AUTHOR.

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in God

ARCHBISHOP

Lord Bishop of

EXETER

To The Reverend

Edward Twiss, Dean :

And To

The Reverend the

Canon of that CHURCH :

This DISCOURSE is

With all Humility and Gratitude

Dedicated by

THE AUTHOR.

A

E R M O N

Preach'd before the

University of OXFORD,

On St. MATTHIAS-DAY, &c.

Acts V. 3, 4.

Peter said, *Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine Heart
to lie unto the Holy Ghost?* —————

—Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God.

TH A T excellent Compendium of the Christian
Doctrines of the Trinity called the *Athanasian
Creed* being appointed to be read on this
Day; a Discourse on that Subject cannot be
thought unseasonable: And because the many Treatises
of the Divinity of the Son of God, occasion'd by the
Revival of an exploded Heresy, have been very
long and convincing; Nothing seems necessary to be
added to justify the Determinations of our Church in
the whole Doctrine of the Trinity; but to prove, That
the Holy Ghost also is a Person in the Divine Essence,
of one Substance, Majesty, and Glory with the Father and
the Son, very and eternal God.

The Ridicule and Contempt with which the Doctrine
of the Trinity hath of late years been treated by One
sort of Men, who endeavour to *banter us* out of the
Belief of it; and the specious Pretences to Reason,
with which another sort would *argue us* out of it; ha-
ving had but too visible Effects on the minds of unwary

A

Men;

2 The Personality and Divinity

Men; 'Tis become absolutely necessary to vindicate this Doctrine, and oppose an Opinion which is now growing Fashionable. When the *Fundamentals* of Christianity are openly struck at, and the tremendous Mysteries of the Gospel expos'd as Impossibilities, Nonsense, and Contradictions; to sit still with Indifference is giving up the Cause; and to decline the Combat, is a confession of the weakness of our Arguments. It is not therefore, I hope, be esteem'd improper, if I take this Occasion, (In pursuance of what many excellent Writers have of late done as to the Divinity of our Saviour) to lay before you the Grounds of our Faith as to the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The method I shall observe in treating this Subject shall be to evince

1. That the Holy Ghost is a Person :
2. That He is a Person *distinct* from both Father and Son : and
3. That He is a Person in the *same Essence* with the Father and the Son.

And this I shall shew to be the Doctrine

1. Of the Holy Scripture, and
2. Of the whole Christian Church, *even before the Council of Nice.*

And first, That the Holy Ghost is a Person. Those who deny the Personality of the Holy Ghost, assert, that either He is a *Power* or *Efficacy* of the Father, or a *Gift* or an *Operation*, or a *Quality*, or an *Attribute*, or an *Accident*, or indeed any thing but what He is, a Person. But it ought to be consider'd how these Notions can be reconcil'd with such Representations of the Holy Ghost as every where occur in the Holy Scripture. There we find St. Paul requesting God, that the Romans ^a might *abound in Hope by the Power of the Holy Ghost*. But to ascribe Power to a mere Power, Efficacy to a mere Efficacy, is incongruous and absurd. The same St. Paul enumerates at another place, the several Gifts of which the Holy Ghost is the Dispenser, ^b *dividing to every man severally as he willet*h : But let our Adversaries themselves

^a Rom. 15. 13. ^b 1 Cor. 12. 11.

Judges whether a mere Gift can be the Author of
 ts; or whether any thing but a Person can bestow
 supernatural Graces, as ^a *Working of Miracles*,
Obedying, *Discerning of Spirits*, and others the like.
 They who assert Him to be an Operation or Quality,
 shew first to shew us, how a mere Operation or Qua-
 lity can act and operate. They who will have Him
 be an Accident, are first to shew, that there can be
 such thing as an Accident in the Divine Essence;
 how an Accident can be said to *intercede with Groan-*
ings, to *bestow Spiritual Gifts*, or to *descend in a bodily*
form. And they who contend that He is an Attribute,
 shew how it can give some Reason, why in the Form of Baptism,
 an Attribute should be join'd with Two which are
 distinctly Persons; or why *that* Attribute rather than
 another. Till some satisfactory Solution be given to
 these Doubts, to concur with these Opinions, were to
 be a Defiance to our Reason.

But we want not *Positive* Arguments to confirm this
 Truth; seeing the Holy Scripture does very fully ex-
 press and represent the Holy Ghost as a Subsisting, In-
 dividual, Intelligent Being, or Person, by attributing to
 Him such Actions and Operations, as none but a Person
 can be the Author of. Thus we find that ^b *He maketh*
cession with Groanings; ^c *that he searcheth all things*;
^d *that He spake to Peter*; ^e *that He spake to the Prophets*
Teachers at Antioch; and more particularly, by our
 Lord Himself the Comforter is describ'd, as a Person
 who ^f *should hear, receive, testify, reprove, and instruct*;
 who can form any Notion of a Quality or Efficacy
preceding with Groanings; who can conceive that a
 mere Gift can *search all things*; and what strange Lan-
 guage is a *Speaking Power*, a *receiving Attribute*, and a
reproving, reprovng, instructing Accident?

Again, in other Places He is set forth as a ^g *Guider*
Director into all Truth; as a *Revealer of the mind of*
 God, not as from Himself, but as capacitated for that

^a 1 Cor. 12. 10. ^b Rom. 8. 26. ^c 1 Cor. 2. 10. ^d Acts 10. 19.
^e 13. 2. ^f John 14. 26. John 15. 26. Id. 15. 27. Id. 16. 8.
 John 16. 13, 14, 15.

4 *The Personality and Divinity*

Office by the other two Persons. ^a At one Place He is said to come, and to be sent ; at another to descend in Bodily shape like a Dove ; sometimes He is said to help our Infirmities, and to dwell in us ; at other times to give us Access to the Father, and to sanctify us unto Obedience. And the conferring a quick understanding, the renewing, sanctifying and justifying us are in all Parts of Holy Scripture attributed to the Spirit as the Immediate Author. What but a Person can be the Author of these Actions? What more convincing Proof can be requir'd, that a thing is an Intelligent, Subsisting Being, than shew that it performs such Operations, as nothing but an Intelligent Being can effect? Is it a thing consistent with the Simplicity of Scripture, or reconcilable with the Infinite Goodness of God himself, thus constantly to present the Holy Ghost as a Person, if He be not one, and to lay us under little less than a Necessity of forming false Ideas and wrong Conceptions of him?

But further ; Not only *Personal Actions*, but *Affections and Faculties purely Personal*, are throughout the holy Scripture, attributed to the Holy Spirit. Thus by St. Paul we are exhorted ^b not to grieve the Spirit; *Isaiah* He is call'd the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, and the Spirit of Knowledge and Fear. In other places He is said to bestow His gifts severally as he willeth ; and lastly, the Jews we are told, provok'd the Spirit of God. What but an Intelligent Being can be the Subject of Grief and Provocation, Will and Understanding? and who does not perceive, that to attribute Grief to a Quality, Provocation to an Efficacy, Will to a Gift, or Understanding to an Attribute, is monstrously absurd, and repugnant to the common and receiv'd Sense of Mankind?

I cannot but add one thing more, which seems evidently to point out to us the Holy Ghost's Personality. That word, which in the Original Language of the new Testament signifies *Spirit*, being of the Neuter Gender, is, when the Holy Ghost is signify'd, in

^a John 15. 26. Luke 3. 22. Rom. 8. 26. 1 Cor. 3. 16. Eph. 4. 30. ^b 1 Pet. 5. 2. *Isai.* 11. 3. Tit. 3. 5. 1 Cor. 6. 11. Rom. 15. 16. *Isai.* 11. 2. 1 Cor. 12. 11. *Isai.* 63. 10.

quently with a Pronoun of the Masculine: So in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; ^a ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα; and in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; ^b πνεῦματι δὲ ἐστὶν ἀρραβὼν. so evidently do these Places seem to represent Him a Person, that the late Author of ^c the Scripture Doctrine of Trinity (who can't be suspected to have given any such an unjustifiable Turn in favour of our Opinion) yet thought fit to render The ^d ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα of St. John, by, *He, That Person, The Spirit of Truth.*

Before I proceed to my second Head, I think it proper to give an Answer to two Objections to the Arguments I have urg'd. The One; that *Personal Actions* being in holy Scripture attributed to things which we know not to be Persons, our Consequence is invalid, at best but precarious. That as, where 'tis said, *charity suffereth long and is kind*; we are to understand not only the Person of such a Man as is actuated by that good Quality; so when any Action which supposes a Person is attributed to the Holy Ghost, it must be interpreted of God the Father, acting by that Quality of which is denominated His Spirit.

But this Objection is fully answer'd by producing Instances of some Actions attributed to the Holy Ghost, which can in no wise be reconcil'd to the Person of the Father; and therefore necessarily infer a Distinction between the Holy Ghost and the Father. Such are ^e *His being sent by the Son; His speaking not as of Himself; His giving His Power from the Son, and glorifying the Son for that Power so receiv'd.* But *that the Person of the Father should be sent by the Son; That the Father should speak not as of Himself; That He should receive Power from the Son, and glorify the Son for that Power so received,* (all manifestly implying a Subordination to the Son) is inconsistent with his being Sovereignly Independent, the sole Origin of all Power and Authority, and the Author and Principle of whatever is done by the Son or the Spirit; which on all hands He is confessed to be. These Actions then being undeniably Personal; and it

John 16. 13. ^b Eph. 1. 13. 14. ^c Dr. Clarke, Scripture Doctrine of Trinity pag. 202. ^d 1 Cor. 13. 4. ^e John 15. 26. and 16. 7. 16. 13. 14.

6 *The Personality and Divinity*

being as certain that they cannot be ascrib'd to the Father acting by any Quality or Energy inherent in Himself, (since that, as I have said, would infer a Subordination to the Son) it evidently follows, that the Holy Ghost is a Person; not an Energy, Power, or Quality of the Father, by which he acts.

The other Objection I propos'd to speak to, is, that in holy Scripture, great variety of Actions are attributed to the Holy Spirit, which bespeak Him a Person; yet other things are there ascrib'd to Him which are inconsistent with the nature of a Person, such are *His being given in measure, and without measure; His being pour'd out; extinguish'd*; and others the like. And therefore the Proofs of His being a Person, drawn from holy Scripture, seem not more conclusive, than those of His not being so.

To which Objection, either of these following Solutions seems sufficient. First, that God the Son alone (whose Personality is not call'd in Question by any of this Age) is sometimes mention'd in Scripture under such a Character, as is in no wise reconcilable with His being a Person: For thus He is said to be *given unto us*; we are commanded to *put on Christ*; and *he which eateth Christ, even he shall live by him*: And he who from those Texts should infer, that the Son of God is not a Person, would justly be condemn'd as a false Reasoner. But what more fully solves the Objection, is, that these Texts instanc'd in, as irreconcilable with his being a Person, are to be understood, not of the Person, but of the Operations of the Holy Ghost of those singular Gifts and Graces, of which He is the Dispenser; and which in the new Testament frequently carry the Name of the Spirit their Author. To these Objections then to this way of arguing appearing too insufficient, I hope I have abundantly evinc'd my Proposition; namely, That the Holy Ghost is a Person.

I come now Secondly to shew, that He is a Person distinct from both Father and Son.

^a John 3. 16. *Isai.* 9. 6. *Rom.* 13. 14. *Gal.* 3. 27. *John* 6. 1. *Cor.* 10. 3, 4.

and here, not to insist on those places of the ^a Old Testament to prove his distinction from the Father, but the $\Pi\gamma$ or Spirit of Jehovah is apparently distinguished from that Jehovah whose Spirit He is; I need to more convincing Evidences drawn from the ^r: such are His ^b being sent by the Son; His receiving from the Son, and His glorifying the Son; all which evidently inconsistent with the Person of the Father.

His being said to ^c proceed from the Father, and sent by the Father, are so many Demonstrations of being a distinct Person from Him, from and by whom He proceeds and is sent. He which was seen descend in a bodily shape, cannot be the same Person God the Father, whom no man hath, nor can see: He who ^e intercedes for us with the Father, cannot be Father with whom He intercedes.

The same Arguments demonstrate that He is not the same because ^f He receiv'd of the Son; was sent by Him; begat him in the womb of the Virgin; descended on Him at His Baptism; and influenc'd, and condescended Him in his State of Humiliation. The Son himself calls Him another Comforter; represents ^g the sin against Himself; and his Disciples that ^h his Mission of the Holy Ghost depended on his own Departure; and lastly perform'd in his own Person, what 'tis Impossible the Holy Ghost perform in His, namely Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection.

And why, but to distinguish Him from the Father and Son, are we baptiz'd into ⁱ His Name, as well as the Name of the Father and the Son? why, but to demonstrate them to be distinct from each other, does the blessed Apostle pray ^k for the Grace of our Lord Jesus and the Love of God the Father, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost? Or how, if He were the same with the Father or Son, could ^l He descend on the Son in a

Isaiah 48. 16. and 63. 8, 9, 10. ^b John 15. 26. and 16. 7. 6. 13, 14. ^c John 15. 26. ^d John 1. 32, 33. Luke 3. 22. 10. ^e Rom. 8. 26, 27. ^f John 16. 14. Chap. 15. 26. ^g Matt. 3. 32. ^h John 16. 7. ⁱ Matt. 28. 19. ^k 2 Cor. 13. 14. ^l Matt. 3.

8 *The Personality and Divinity*

Bodily shape, the Father from Heaven testifying his Affection.
 Lastly; without supposing them to be Three distinct Persons, no satisfactory Solution can be given, in the great Work of Man's Salvation, a distinct Counsel and Operation should be proper to each of Them; why * the Father only should be said to *elect*; the Son only to *have shed and sprinkled His blood, as the price of Redemption*; and the Holy Ghost only to *sanctify unto Obedience*.

What has been said, being I conceive, sufficient to persuade us, that the Holy Ghost is a Person; such a Person as is neither the Father nor the Son; it remains that I proceed in the

Third and last Place, To shew, that He is a Person in the *same Essence*; of the *same Majesty* and *Co-equal* with the Father and Son; *very and eternal God*.

Among the many Places of Holy Scripture which plainly point out to us the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, that which I have chosen for a Text to this Discourse seems very remarkable and full. In these Words *Peter* tells *Ananias* that *He had lied to the Holy Ghost*; that in lying to the Holy Ghost, He had not lied unto Man only, but in so doing, *He had lied unto God*: The Consequence is easy and obvious; namely, that if lying unto the Holy Ghost be lying unto God, the Holy Ghost is God.

The Design of the Apostle's Reprimand being now to give *Ananias* the deepest Sense of the Heinousness of his Sin, by setting before Him the Greatness of the Person whom He had offended; He ought, (if by the Holy Ghost He had meant any other thing than God) to have stated it thus; *Thou hast not lied to Men only, nor to the Holy Ghost only, but to God*; Whereas it now lies in the Text; there being no Opposition between *the lying to the Holy Ghost, and to God*, as there is between *the lying to Man and God*; 'tis apparent, that *Ananias* lied unto God, not otherwise than as He lied unto the Holy Ghost.

At the Conception of the Son of God, the Blessed Virgin was told, that ^b *that holy thing which should be born of her*.

* 1 Pet. 1. 2. Rom. 8. 29. Heb. 12. 24. 2 Thess. 2. 13. b Luke 1. 35.

of Her, should therefore be call'd the Son of God, be-
 gotten by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. A
 declaration, which could never be made good, were
 the Holy Ghost God; since then our Saviour must
 have been the Son of a Creature.

St. Paul tells us, that ^a our Bodies are the Temples of the
 Holy Ghost; this sufficiently intimates His Divinity; be-
 cause the Habitation of a Creature is not capable of giv-
 ing the Name of a Temple. If He tells us, that we are the
 Temple of God, because the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; let our
 adversaries vindicate this from being false Reasoning,
 unless the Holy Spirit be truly and properly God.

St. Moses inform us, that ^b when He went in before the
 Lord Jehovah to speak with him, he took the veil off until
 he came out; St. Paul, in a manifest Allusion to this
 story, tells us, that the Lord is that Spirit; and where
 the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty. From whence
 may we easily draw this Inference; That Person to whom
 the Lord spake, was Jehovah; that Person (according to
 St. Paul) was that Spirit; and that Spirit, the Spirit of
 the Lord, or the Holy Ghost.

St. David say, that ^c the Israelites in the wilderness,
 tempted and provoked the most High God; the Prophet Isaiah,
 the Apostle to the Hebrews, apply this Temptation
 to the Holy Ghost.

St. Isaiah report, that ^d the Lord sent a Message by his
 Prophet; St. Paul lets us know, that this Message was de-
 liver'd by the Holy Ghost to the Prophet.

St. Peter say, that ^e Prophecy came not in old time by

1 Cor. 6. 19. and 3. 16. So St. Austin (Epist. 66. ad Maxim. vol. 2.
 A. Edit. Basil. 1541) Si templum ei facere, sicut Solomon fecit. &c.
 Epiphanius (Hæres. 74. p 902. D. Paris 1622) Τμῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ
 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ οἰκᾷ ἐν ὑμῖν. Εἰ πῖνω τοῦ Θεοῦ χαλόμεθα
 καὶ πνεῦμα, τίς πολμήσει παραστήσει τὸ πνεῦμα,
 καὶ λατρεύσει τὸν Θεόν ἡμῶν. ^b Exod. 34. 34 compar'd with
 1. 3. 15, 16, 17. ^c Psal. 78. 18. 41. 56. and 106. 14. Isai. 63. 10.
 3. 7, 8, 9. ^d Isa. 6. 9. compar'd with Acts 28. 25. ^e 2 Pet. 1.
 21. Tim. 3. 16. So Theodoret (in 2 Tim. 3. 16.) Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα
 ἡμῶν, εἴτε ἄλλως ἢ ἡ ἀποστολὴ τοῦ πνεύματος. Vide & Basil de Spirit. Sanct. ch. 21. p. 340. E. πῶς ὁ
 Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν ὀνομάζον, &c.

10 *The Personality and Divinity*

*the Will of Man, but holy Men of God spake as they were mov'd by the Holy Ghost; St. Paul adds, that all holy Scripture is *deus inspiratus*, inspir'd by God.*

If the same St. Paul, discoursing of the Diversity of Spiritual Gifts, assert, that ^a they are given by that God which worketh all in all; He yet adds, that all worketh that one and the self same Spirit.

If Moses tells us, that ^b The Lord Jehovah led Israel out of Egypt; the Prophet Isaiah applies this to the Spirit the Lord.

In the last words of the Prophet David, He who at one Place call'd ^c The Spirit of the Lord, is immediately after, term'd The God of Israel, and the Rock of Israel.

If the Prophet Jeremiah inform us, that ^d The Lord Jehovah will make a new Covenant with the House of Israel, the Author to the Hebrews assures us, that this is spoken by the Holy Ghost.

If our Saviour declare, that the Sin ^e against the Holy Ghost is for ever unpardonable; Our own Reason and Conscience discover that the Holy Ghost is God; Not that it is therefore unpardonable, because He is God; but that unless he were God it could not be unpardonable. For 'tis the highest Absurdity to imagine, that the Crime, when committed against an Infinite Being should be remissible, yet for ever irremissible when committed against a Finite One.

As we thus find in both Testaments the Name of God bestow'd on Him; so, as a stronger Proof of the Truth, such Attributes are there given Him, as are proper to the Divine Essence, and Incommunicable to any Other. Thus, He who is call'd, ^f the eternal Spirit, and He by whom the Heavens were created, must necessarily be Eternal, and know no Beginning. ^g He whose Presence neither Heaven nor Hell, nor the uttermost parts of the Earth can screen one; ^h He to whom a human Body is a Temple, has the Attribute of Omnipresence, which a Creature cannot have; must Necessarily

^a 1 Cor. 12. 6, 11. ^b Deut. 32. 12. comp. Isai. 63. 10. ^c 23. 2, 3. ^d Jer. 31. 31. comp. Heb. 10. 15, 16. ^e Matt. 12. 31. ^f Heb. 9. 14. Job 26. 13. Psal. 33. 6. Gen. 1. 2. ^g Psal. 77. 8, 9. ^h 1 Cor. 3. 16. and 6. 19.

God, because none but God is so. He who ^a search-
all things, even the deep things of God, cannot be of the
number of Creatures; none of them knowing the Mind
of the Lord, none of them having been his Counsellour.
He who could show the Apostles ^b the things to come;
He who at the beginning foretold that Some in the
future days should depart from the Faith; Has a certain
knowledge of future Contingencies, the Undoubt-
ed prerogative of God only.

His Divine Attributes bespeak him God; so also
the Divine Operations ascrib'd to Him as their Au-

If Actions flow from the Essence of the Agent,
the Nature of the Holy Ghost will be demonstrated
from the Operations which he *did*, and *does* per-

Such are chiefly, his ^c miraculous Conception of the
Son of God in the womb of a Virgin; His impowering him
to cast out Devils; His conferring on the Apostles that
extraordinary Gift of Tongues; His conferring Spiritual Gifts;
His raising Jesus Christ from the Dead; and his raising
the Dead, by quickning our Mortal Bodies. The working
of these Miracles as These, implies a Divine Power in
the Author; since no one can suspend, or act in Con-
travention to the Laws of Nature, but he only which
gives Laws to Nature.

Further Argument for the Divinity of the Holy
Ghost drawn from Scripture, is the Divine Honour and
Worship which is to be paid to Him. Both the Nature
of religious Worship it self, and the Express Commands
given us in both Testaments, do so clearly Demonstrate,
that God only is to be worshipped; that if it can be
prov'd from Scripture, that Divine Honour is due
to the Holy Ghost; the Consequence, that He is God,
cannot, I conceive, be deny'd or question'd. A Com-
mand for this Divine Worship is imply'd in our being
baptiz'd in his Name: In which most Solemn Act, we
profess our Faith in Him, declare Our Hope on Him,
and shew a perpetual Obedience to Him. Examples of

Cor. 2. 10, 11. So Epiphanius. Hær. 74. Sect. 13. p. 903. A.
ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ βᾶθρον Θεοῦ ἐρευνῶν; b John
and 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2. c Matt. 1. 18. 20. Matt. 12. 28. Acts 2. 4.
14. 11. 1 Pet. 3. 18. Rom. 8. 11. d Matt. 28. 19

12 The Personality and Divinity

this Divine Worship are frequent in Scripture: Such that of St. John, imploring Grace and Peace on the *Attick Churches* from the *Seven Spirits* which are before the Throne of God: An Expression, by which the Holy Ghost must be signify'd, both because 'tis not Credible that St. John should in an Act of Religious Worship join any Created Being with God the Father and his Son Christ Jesus: (as He must, if with some Interpreters we expound the Place of the Holy Angels) as also, because that Phrase is very Conformable to a common Speech among the Jews; Who, from the eleventh of *Isaiah* and the Second verse, ^b used to speak much of the Seven Spirits of the Messiah. We have two Illustrations of Religious Worship paid to the Holy Ghost by St. Paul Himself: The One, where he begs for the Corinthians the *Communion of the Holy Ghost*, as well as Grace from the Son, and Love from the Father: The other, where he calls the Holy Ghost to witness to the Truth of his Profession, and the Sincerity of his Conscience; ^d *My Conscience*, says He, *bearing me witness to the Holy Ghost*. This his Asseveration is plainly an Oath, and an Oath is certainly one of the highest Acts of Religious Worship; God being then call'd on as Privy to the Secrets of Mens Hearts: and as a Witness to the Truth or an Avenger of the Falseness of what They testify.

I shall content myself with adding only One Argument more to prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost taken from that Part which he bears in the Government and Disposal of the *Church-Militant*: A Person which Necessarily requires and supposes him a Divine Person. When our Saviour was about to ascend into Heaven; He promis'd to send his Disciples another Comforter or Advocate; who was to perform a Part proper to Himself, in Ruling and Ordering the Christian Church; and to Exercise such Offices, Functions, and Operations as are peculiar to Him in the great Work of Man's Salvation. The Chief of these Offices, are to Sanctify us; to make us Regenerate; to Lead, Direct, and Govern us, in all our Words and Works.

^a Rev. 1. 4. ^b See p. 341. of the 1st Vol. of Dr. Lightfoot's Works. Ed. Lond. 1684. ^c 2 Cor. 13. 14. ^d Rom. 9. 1, vid. & Whistly in

that we may perform such things as are acceptable and
 pleasing to God; to make us Members of that
 Body, of which Christ is the Head; to Create in Us a
 Sense of the Paternal Love of God towards us; to Sanctify
 and Set apart fit Persons for the Office of the Ministry;
 to declare God's Will to us; to reveal God's Mind in
 Matters above the Ordinary Power, and Course
 of Nature; to Produce in us good Dispositions towards
 Virtue; and (to mention no more) to Actuate, Inform,
 and Enliven the *whole* Body of *Christ's* Church. This
 being his Office; what less than an Almighty Power
 can be sufficient for these Things, Equal to this Task?
 Since the Souls and Hearts of Men are the Subjects of
 his Government, a *perfect* Intimacy and *thorough* Ac-
 quaintance with our Thoughts and Intentions is In-
 dispensably requisite to One, who by his Office is to
 rule and conduct Them. And, as for that purpose
 He must be Omniscient; so 'tis Necessary that his Power
 should be Infinite, and his Presence Universally Exten-
 sive: For, how otherwise can He rule and govern all
 these External Events, by which our Passions are mov'd,
 our Inclinations conceiv'd, and Our Desires regulated?
 What, less than an Almighty Power, can dispose such a
 vast Variety of Accidents as relate to such Infinite
 Numbers of Men, so distant and remote from each
 other, in Time, Place, Estate, and Temper. The Di-
 vine Perfections are *questionless* requisite to the Person
 that performs this Office; and therefore the Divine
 Perfections belong to the Holy Ghost, because He *does*
 perform this Office.

It will, I presume, be Matter of some Comfort to the
 Professors of this Doctrine to Observe, that the Sub-
 stance of the Faith *once for all deliver'd to the Saints*, has
 been preserv'd in the Church entire and uncorrupted;
 and been transmitted to Us by *faithful* Witnesses: and
 we cannot but with Pleasure observe, that the most
 primitive Fathers, (who are *questionless* the Best Inter-
 preters of Holy Scripture) concur with our Opinion.
 On the other hand; the Opposers of this Faith *must* be
 concern'd, to see, that in a Controverted Point, *all* An-
 tiquity, (which being nearer the Fountain and Begin-
 ning

14 *The Personality and Divinity*

ning of Truth, had thereby Better Means of Understanding it, than We of these Distant Ages) held Sentiments *Diametrically Opposite* to what They advance. They cannot also but be Sensible, how unreasonable it is to suppose, that in so momentous and weighty a Doctrine as is This of the Trinity, the Christian Church should so soon after its Establishment, have gone from the Truth, and maintain a false Doctrine: I proceed therefore to evince

Secondly; That this was the Establish'd Faith of the Christian Church, even *before* the Council of Nice. Our Adversaries not thinking it fit to lay claim to the Ages succeeding that Council.

And here; though I am very sensible how extremely tedious to my Audience a Profusion of Quotations will appear; Yet since I know None that has Professedly treated on this Subject, I may Reasonably promise myself, that all the true Sons of Our most holy Church will with Pleasure receive Proof, that Her Determinations in *this* matter, as well as all others, are supported by so *Venerable* an Authority as that of the Anti-Nicean Church.

To the Personality of the Holy Ghost these words of *Origen* give full Testimony. *The Holy Spirit*, says he, *is not as some imagine, an Operation of God; not having in their Opinion, a proper Subsistence. For the Apostle, having enumerated the Gifts of the Spirit, immediately subjoins. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every One severally as he Willeth; But if He Will and Operates, and Divides, He is therefore an Operating Substance, not a meer Operation.* And at another Place the same Author is yet more Express; where arguing against those who asserted that the Holy Ghost is not a Distinct Person; He declares, *b We* (that is, the Catholics) *are persuaded that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are, $\eta\upsilon\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\omega\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ three Persons.*

I might to this Purpose produce some of those also

a Origen in the Catena on John 3. 8. p. 90, 91. Ed. Corderius twerp. 1630. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς τῆς εἰσότητος &c. b Origen, Comment. Evang. Vol. 2d. p. 56. D. E. Ed. Huetius, Rothom. 1668. $\eta\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$

berless Places, where the Fathers attribute such
ctions to him, as necessarily suppose him a Person.
because This would be extreemly redious, I shall
ance only in *One* Action which infers his Personali-
namely, the manner of his Descent on our Saviour
His Baptism in the Shape of a Dove: which Descent
hold to be, not (as 'tis now generally interpreted),
aphorical; but *Real* and *Corporeal*: For so *Justin*
tyr expresses it by *the Spirit descending in the Shape*
Dove. *Origen* expresses it by *the Holy Ghost's being seen*
Shape of a Dove; and *Lactantius* by, *the Spirit of God*
ended on him, form'd into the Shape of a White Dove.
above all, *Tertullian* is very bold; saying, *c that the*
it descended on our Lord in the Body of a Dove; that
was then as truly a Dove as a Spirit; that in assuming
extraneous Substance, he destroy'd not his own proper Sub-
stance; and that if it be ask'd what became of that Body of
when the Spirit return'd into Heaven; He answers,
like those Aerial Bodies with which the Angels upon Ex-
ordinary Occasions cloath themselves, it was reduc'd to
nothing, as it had at first been made out of Nothing.
is not to my Purpose to enquire how agreeable to
this Interpretation may be; But this is evident
this their Exposition, that They must have held
Holy Ghost to be a Person; Nothing else being ca-
of being cloath'd with a Bodily shape.
that they held him to be a distinct Person from both
Father and Son, I might easily evince, by laying

such are *Irenæus* L. 3. C. 19. p. 243. Edit. Grabe. and *Novatian*
in. C. 29. passim. Ed. ad cal. *Tertull.* Cologn 1617. *b Justin* Dial.
D. 316. C. D. Paris 1615. *c Origen* con. Cels. L. 1. p. 34.
677. *τὸ αἶμα πνέουσαν* & *ὁ πνεῦμα* & *ὁ εἶς αὐτὸς*. *d Lactant.*
C. 15. p. 355. Ed. Oxon. 1684. *Descendit super eum Spiritus Dei*
in Speciem Columbæ Candidæ. *e Tertullian* de Car. Chris.
p. 360. A. Paris 1634. *Spiritum Columbæ corpore delapsum de-*
super Dominum. Qui Spiritus cum hoc esset, tam vere erat
quàm & Spiritus; *Neque interfecerat Substantiam pro-*
assumpta Substantia Extranea. Sed quæris, Corpus Columbæ
resumpto Spiritu in Cælum? Æque & Angelorum, & eadem
interceptum est, quæ & editum fuerat. Si vidisses cum de
proferebatur, scisses cum in Nihilum subducebatur. Si non
initium visibile, nec Finis. Tamen soliditas Corporis erat
no Momento Corpus videbatur.

before

16 *The Personality and Divinity*

before you some of those Passages in their Writings where the Three Persons are *distinctly* nam'd, and *Different Operation* ascrib'd to each of them. But it would be troublesome to recite these Passages from the Father; and as when That should be done, it would only shew the Opinion of so many *Private Men*; I shall better see what was the Doctrine of the *Catholic*, by observing her Behaviour towards *Men*, as arising in several remote Parts of the Earth and at several Periods of Time, *deny'd* a Distinction of Persons in the Divine Essence.

When *Praxeas* at *Rome*, in the Beginning of the Third Century, explain'd the Doctrine of the Trinity to assert but *One Person* in the Divine Nature, but *Three Denominations*; and that the Trinity in Unity was no other than *One Person* consider'd under different Respects; * *Tertullian* argu'd against it as a *Novel Error*; oppos'd to it the *Received* Doctrine of the Church, asserted a Trinity of *Distinct Persons* in the Creeds and Confessions of Faith, which had been the Standards of Religion ever since the *First* planting of Christianity; and bitterly inveigh'd against *Praxeas* as an *Innovator* in the Christian Faith. When *Praxeas* appear'd, and maintain'd the same Error which *Praxeas* had done; He was *rejected* out of Communion from the Christian Church, as a *Teacher of such Doctrine* as neither the *Prophets*, nor *Apostles*, nor the *Christian Church* from her *First Institution* had espoused or thought of. After all these, *Sabellius* in *Libya* broach'd the same Doctrine; † *Dionysius of Alexandria*, One of the most eminent Bishops of that Age, *strenuously* oppos'd Him, and *Wrote* against it. *Novatian* ‡ sticks not to call it *Heresy*. And the Names of † *Hermogenes* and ‡ *Epiphanius*

* *Tertullian* adv. *Prax.* c. 2 p. 635. B. Hanc Regulam ab Evangelii &c. † Vid. *Epiphanius* in *Hær.* 57. p. 479. D 480. D Paris 1622. ‡ *Dionysius Alex.* apud *Euseb.* Hist. L. 7. c. 253. A. and what he wrote against *Sabellius* see in *Euseb.* 26. p. 277. A Edit. *Vales.* & *Novatian* Lib. de Trin. p. 714. and *cal* *Tertullian* Paris 1675. ‡ Vid. *Augustin* de *Hæres.* c. 44. 198. *Cantab.* 1687. f. See the Catalogue of *Hæreticks* and *Tertullian* de *Præscrip.* p. 254. C. Paris 1634.

at this Time found in the list of Hereticks, for ad-
 vancing and maintaining the same Opinion.

May, so careful were the Christians of the First Ages
 to maintain this Distinction of Persons, that they plac'd
 that Part of the Difference between the Jewish and
 Christian Faiths in this very Thing. It's the Faith of
 the Jews, says 'Tertullian, to believe God to be One in such a
 manner as to exclude the Son and Holy Spirit: For what
 difference, but This, is there between Them and Us? And
 Lactantius seem'd not Fully enough to have assert-
 ed the Proper Subsistence of the Holy Ghost; He was
 afterwards look't on, as, in That Particular at least, a
 Scholizer with the Jews. From their attributing
 before Personal Actions to the Holy Ghost, it follows
 They held Him to be a Person: And from their
 treating as Hereticks Those who Deny'd a Trinity of
 distinct Persons, I infer, that They held Him to be such
 a Person as is neither the Father nor the Son.

That They held Him to be a Person in the Divine
 Nature, I shall endeavour to Prove from Many Con-
 siderations: The First of which shall be,
 their Professing to Believe in Him in their Creeds.

To believe in a Person, is, in the Language of Scrip-
 ture and the Church, to Believe Him to be God. And
 therefore; when in the Fourth Century, the Opposers
 of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost argu'd from the Si-
 lence of the Fathers of the Council of Nice; and con-
 tended, that because They did not in their Creed in Ex-
 press Terms declare the Holy Ghost to be God, that
 therefore They did not esteem Him to be God: It was
 answer'd by the Catholicicks; that though the Fathers
 of that Council did not in their Creed declare in Ex-
 press Words the Divinity of the Holy Ghost: yet their
 Intent and Belief of it was sufficiently imply'd in Their

Tertullian adv. Prax. C. 31. p. 663. B. Judaicæ fidei ista res sic
 Deum credere, ut Filium annumerare ei nolis, & post Fili-
 um, Spiritum. Quid enim erit inter Nos & Illos nisi Differentia ista?
 Irenæus in Ep. ad Pammach. & Ocean. (p. 64. H. I. of the 2d
 of his Works. Ed. Paris 1546) Lactantius in Libris suis, &
 in Epistolis ad Demetrianum, Spiritus Sancti negat Sub-
 stantiam. Et, errore Judaico, dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel
 cum Patre esse. vid. Epiphanius in Hæc. 74. Sect. 14. p. 904. A. B.

18 *The Personality and Divinity*

Article, *I Believe in the Holy Ghost.* If I may be allow'd the same Way of Arguing, it is beyond Contradiction Evident, that the Christian Church in *All Ages*, especially the *First*) believ'd Him to be God; Since never was any *Publick* or *Receiv'd* Creed in which this Article was Omitted; But it has been *always* a Part of the Creed, and is *a Coeval with Christianity*. With those Ancient Creeds which we meet with in the Writings of *b Irenæus* and *c Novatian*; and those of *d Lucian the Martyr*, and *e Gregory of Neocæsarea*, transmitted to Us. But more especially witness that the *Ancient Creed* explain'd in *St. Cyril's Catechetick Lectures* Which had been from the *First Ages* the *Receiv'd Creed* of the Church of *Jerusalem*; and did not borrow, (some Learned Men have Imagin'd) those *f* Clauses concerning the Holy Ghost, which It has in Common with the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, from that Creed; it appearing by *very good Arguments*, that *This Creed* (which was Undoubtedly the *Ancient Creed* of the *Eastern Churches*) had those Clauses *before* the Time when the Council of *Constantinople* subjoin'd them to the Creed compos'd at *Nice*.

a Sir P. King's Hist. of the Creed, p. 317. *b* Irenæus, L. 1. p. 45. and L. 4. c. 62. *c* Novatian de Trin. c. 29. Eadem de Veritatis &c. *d* Lucian's Creed, and its Genuineness prov'd, Bull's Def. Fid. Nic. p. 255. &c. Ed Oxon. 1685. *e* Gregor. Paris 1621 p. 1. *f* B. Bull in his Jud. Eccl. Cath. has clearly shewn This: Tho' it must be confess'd, that the Agreement of St. Cyril's the Constantinopolitan Creed is so little, that it seems not to give Ground for that Conjecture. However, There is in Epiphanius Anchoratu, p. 123, A. Vol. 2. Paris 1622) a Creed *Verbatim* the same with that which we call the Constantinopolitan; Epiphanius calls it the Creed of the 318 Fathers, by whom none can be meant but the Council of Nice: And 'tis certain, (as appears from Epiphanius Ibid. and Usher de Symb. p. 18. Lond. 1647) that Epiphanius wrote his Treatise de Anchoratu at least seven Years before the Council of Constantinople sat. I know no better way of reconciling This Difficulty, than by asserting, that what has been supposed (perhaps without Reason) to have happen'd to St. Cyril's Creed, really happen'd to this in Epiphanius; namely, that tho' the Treatise in which it is found, be Older than the Council of Constantinople; yet after that Council had been held, Epiphanius or some Other Person for Him, thought fit to insert into his de Anchoratu, the Clauses which the Council of Constantinople added to the Creed compos'd at Nice.

at Secondly; another Argument that the *Ante-Nicene* Christians believ'd the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, is from their joining *His* Name with Those of the *Father* and *Son* in their *Form of Baptism*. They could not know that *That* Form sets *All the Three Persons* in *Equality*, in a Thing that can Only belong to the *one Nature*; None, but a Person in *That* Nature, qualify'd to receive Men from a State of Sin to the State of Grace, to the Rights of Sons of God, and Hopes of Eternal Bliss: They could not be Ignorant how *Absurd* it would be, that *This* should be perform'd in the Name, and by the Authority of any *Created* Being; And therefore, since in this Solemn Act they join'd both the Son and the Holy Ghost with God the Father, it *must* be suppos'd that They believ'd Them to be *One God with the Father*. That They *did* Baptize into His Name, is Evident from the *Express* Testimonies of *Justin a Martyr*, *Irenaus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*. Nay more; in the Conferring of Baptism, a bare Recitation of the *Three Names* was thought sufficient to make that Baptism *Valid*; but they further requir'd a *True and Orthodox Profession of Faith on the Trinity*, as Explain'd and held forth by the *publick Church*, as of *Absolute Necessity* to the *Validity* of Baptism. Thus *b* St. *Cyprian* denies the Validity of the *Novatian's* Baptism, because their Sentiments of the Trinity were *not* Conformable to the *Church Catholick*: As the *Plenary Council of Arles* *c* order'd, that None should be receiv'd into Communion with the Church, such as, upon Examination, should be found to Answer to the *Right Faith* on the Trinity: And it was,

See Justin's ad Apol. p. 94. Cologn 1686. Irenaus L. 1. c. 1. of the Creed, (in which a Belief on the Holy Ghost is propos'd) calls it *καθὼς ἀναστῆναι ἐκ τοῦ ὁδοῦ βαπτισματὸς εἰς αὐτόν*. Clem. p. 800. Ed. Cologn 1688. Tertullian de Bapt. c. 6. and L. adv. c. 27. and Cyprian in Epist. p. 205. 213. 221. 223. Ed. Ox. 1682. Cyprian Ep. 73. p. 200. Nunquid hanc Trinitatem Marcion tenet? quid eundem asserit, quem & Nos Patrem Creatorem? Num eundem Unum Filium Christum? — Longe alia est apud Marcionem Fides. — Quomodo ergo potest videri, qui apud illos confectus esse Peccatorum remissionem, & Divinae Indulgentiae Gratiā per suam Fidem, qui ipsius Fidei non habuerit Veritatem? Concil. Arelat. 1. Canon 8.

201 *The Personality and Divinity*

questionless, with an Eye and Regard to This Practice the Church, That the Holy Fathers of the Council ^a *Nice* order'd, that the Followers of *Paul of Samosata* should not be receiv'd as Members of the Catholic Church without being First Baptiz'd; Not that They had not been before Baptiz'd with the True Form of Baptism, (for ^b *Athanasius* Expressly assures us, that *Paulianists* did use the Right Form) But because the *Impious* Tenets concerning the Son of God, had, in Judgment of the Orthodox, render'd that Pretence of Baptism Invalid, and merely Theatrical. And this Argument will receive the Greatest Strength and Weight when I shall Hereafter produce those Passages, where the Fathers in express Terms call the Holy Spirit God. For, from Them it will appear, that this True and Orthodox Confession of the Trinity, which they require as Essentially Necessary to the Validity of Baptism, was with Regard to the Holy Ghost, none Other than a Belief of his Divinity.

My Third Argument to Shew the Divinity of the Holy Ghost from the Ante-Nicene Fathers, is taken from Their ascribing to Him Such Attributes, as None but a Person in the Divine Essence can be possess'd of.

Thus ^c *Clement* of *Alexandria* says, that He is Omnipresent; ^d *Origen*, that He is Incomprehensible: and ^e *Novatian* ascribes to Him such Actions, as None but an Omnipotent Being can perform. But because an Eternity of Being, or the having No beginning of Existence, is the most Distinguishing Attribute of the Godhead, and supposes or includes all other Divine Perfections, I wave all other Attributes and shall speak only to This.

In the Second Book inscrib'd to *Autolycus*, ^f *Theophilus* thus Descants; The Holy Prophets, says He, were

^a Concil. Nicen. i. Can. 19. ^b Vid. Athanas. con. Arrian. Op. p. 219. Edit. Commelinus. 1601. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ὡς ἅλλαι ἀποστολὴς καὶ τὸ οὐδέποτε, μὴδὲν μὴ γενέσθαι δεδωκεν, &c. ^c Clement. ad. Paed. l. i. c. 6. p. 103. Cologn. 1688. ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ αὐτὸ παρρησιάζεται. ^d Origen con. Cels. l. 8. p. 313. Cantabrigie. ^e Novatian de Trin. c. 29. passim. ^f Theophil. ad Autol. l. 2. c. 12. Ed. ad. cal. Justin. Martyr. Cologn. 1686. οὗ γὰρ πνεύματος εἶναι ὅτι ὁ κόσμος ἐγενήθη. ἀλλ' ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔστι καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. ὁ λόγος ὁ αὐτοῦ, ὁ αὐτοῦ, ὁ αὐτοῦ ἀμπαρῶν αὐτοῦ.

when the World was made; (an Expression which, doubt, the Inspir'd Writers, as well as the Primitive Writers, borrow'd from the Jewish Idiom, in which, Existing Before the World was the Usual Phrase to denote Eternity) But the Wisdom (by which He always creates the Spirit) of God, which was in Him, and his Holy Spirit, are always present with Him. God, says ^a Irenæus, needed the Assistance of the Angels in Creating What He had before determin'd; For His Word and his Wisdom, His Son and Spirit, are always present with Him. And immediately after He asserts; That The Spirit was with God before the Creation, Proving it by these Words of Solomon, Lord by his Wisdom hath founded the Earth. Gregory Neocæsarea asserts, that, there never was a Time when Father existed Without the Son, or the Son without the Father. Novatian ^c in express Words ascribes to Him a co-eternity. And Tertullian must upon his own Principles have Believ'd His Coeternity; For as He Believ'd Him to be Truly God, (as I shall Hereafter shew by many Instances) So, He affirms, that whatever is God, is necessarily Eternal: They are the Properties of God, says ^d always to have Existed, without Beginning, and without End: And again, God is a Stranger to a Beginning and of Existence. These Citations are, I presume, sufficient to attest His Eternity: And therefore I pass lightly over that Multitude of Places, where They ascribe unto Him the Creation of the World; And where They Compare and Parallel His Procession from the Father with the Emanation of Light from the Body

^a Irenæus L. 4. C. 37. p. 330, 331. Adelt ei semper Verbum & Spiritus, Filius & Spiritus. & Ibid. Quoniam & Sapiencia, quæ cum Patre erat apud Deum ante omnem Constitutionem, per Semper ait, Deus Sapiencia fundavit Terram. ^b Gregor. Thaumaturgus. Fid. p. 1. Oper. Paris 1621. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πῶς ἦν ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ. ^c Novatian de Trin. c. 29. Cum Spiritus Sancti co-eternitate Sociari. ^d Tertullian adv. Hermog. c. 6. p. 268. D. Dei vindicamus, Semper fuisse, Sine Initio, Sine Fine. & Adv. Marcion. p. 435. D. Deus alienus ab Initio & Fine esse. Theophil. ad. Autol. p. 96. D. Iren. L. 1. c. 19. p. 93. L. 4. p. 10. Grabe's Note in Iren. p. 330. f. Athenag. Legat. p. 10. D. 11. ad Gal. Justin. Col. 1686. Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 8. p. 640. A. Illustration; says the Pseudo-Justin p. 380. B. Col. 1686, which presents to Us both the *Sanctus* and the *eternus* nature.

22 *The Personality and Divinity*

of the Sun : Both which might in this Place be *Appo*
ly made Use of to evince His Coeternity.

My Fourth Argument shall be taken from That *D*
vine Worship with which the Catholick Church thow
fit to Honour Him. I need not Here stand to Pro
that the Christians of those Ages, which are the Subj
of our present Enquiry, were ^a *Universally* of Opin
that *God only* is to be Worship'd ; since any the La
Acquaintance with their Practice or Writings abundan
ly shews it : And therefore, taking *This* for grant
that They worshipped Nothing but What They thou
to be *God*, I proceed to my Proofs of Their Worsh
ping the Holy Ghost.

St. ^b *Basil*, (for, I think, Few at *This* time deny
Treatise *de Spiritu Sancto*, extant among his Works
be *His*) has preserv'd a Doxology made use of by
Clement of Rome ; in which the Holy Ghost is join'd w
the Father and Son : *Ignatius* ^c concludes his Epistle
the *Ephesians* with a Doxology of the *Same Kind* : *A*
^d *Polycarp* finish'd the most *Solemn* Part of his Life,
Martyrdom, with an Act of Worship to God the
ther, in Conjunction with the Son and Holy Sp
Clement of Alexandria shuts up his Books of *The* ^e *P*
gogue with an Act of Adoration, in which the H
Ghost is *Formally* address'd to : And St. *Basil* app
f to the Expositions of the Psalms which *Origen*
written for Evidences of *His* Worshipping the H
Ghost. Thus far for the Practice of *Private* and *P*
cular Men indeed, but They the *Greatest* Lights of
First Centuries : What the Practice of the Church

^a See Justin's 2d Apol. p. 63. 64. Tatian, Orat. p. 144. C. T
phil. ad Aut. p. 110. D. Melito in Chronic. Alex. p. 259. Paris
Clemens Strom. L. 7. p. 711. C. 722. A. Origen. con. Cels. p.
233. 386. Cyprian de Exh. Mart. p. 171. Dionysius Alex.
Euseb. Hist. L. 7. c. 11. Arnobius L. 3. p. 100. Leyden 1651.
Lactantius p. 202. 320. 403. ^b Basil de Sp. S. c. 29. p. 358. C.
ad Paris 1637. ^c Ignatius in Ep. ad Ephes. p. 47. Ed. Oxon.
^d Polycarp, apud Euseb. Hist. L. 4. C. 15. p. 133. D. Paris
^e Clemens Alex. Pæd. L. 3. C. 12. p. 266. — τὸ μόνον ὁ Θεὸς
— οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο θεὸν ἀντιτάξαι αὐτῷ — ὃς ἡ δόξα
οἷς τὰς αἰῶνες. ^f Basil de Spir. San. c. 29. p. 358. E.

vident from Justin^a Martyr's *Apology*; who refutes that
 umny thrown on the Christians of *His* Age, that They
 re *Atheists* and *Contemners* of the Worship of God, by
 ng, That with regard to the Pretended Gods of the Hea-
 s, the Christians might justly be represented as *Atheists*, but
 so with Respect to the most True God the Father of Righte-
 ness and Temperance; For Him, continues He, and the Son
 ch Proceeded from Him — and the Prophetick Spirit, We
 ship and Adore, Honouring Them Rationally and Truly.
 d this he a Second Time averrs, saying, That after the
 ber, They with Reason Honour'd the Son in the second
 ce, and the Prophetick Spirit in the Third. If This way
 Answering be any thing to the Purpose for which 'tis
 duc'd, it must Suppose, that the Christians both Be-
 d the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and ascrib'd to
 a Divine Worship: For, to affirm that They Worship-
 he True God, because They Worship'd the Father,
 and Spirit, is a very *Weak* and *Absurd* way of Ar-
 g, unless They believ'd the Father, Son and Spirit
 e the One True God, and Worship'd them as such: And
 ed, is so far from being a Defence and Justification
 e Christians, whose Cause He is pleading; That it
 es Them Guilty of *that very Crime*, with which He
 charges the Heathens, namely, of Worshipping as
 what really is not God.

ut to put this Matter beyond all Dispute; There
 e Greatest Certainty that the Ante-Nicene Chri-
 s Worship'd the Holy Ghost; because Several of the
 ns of Prayer, which We are ascertain'd They did
 efs to Him, are at this Time Extant: Such, for in-
 e, is that Prayer Extant in St. Basil^b de Sp. San.

Justin. Apol. p. 56. Εὐδεν ὃ καὶ Ἀθεοὶ κακλήμεθα. καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν
 τον νομιζομένων Θεῶν ἁδοιοι εἶναι. ἀλλ' ἐχὶ τῷ ἀληθεστάτῳ καὶ
 ε δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης. --- ἀλλ' ἐκαίνον τὸ, καὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτῷ
 δόντι --- πνεῦμα τὸ τὸ πνευματικὸν σέβειμεθα καὶ προσκυνῶμεν,
 καὶ ἀληθεῖα πμῶντες. And afterwards, p. 60. ὁδὸν αὐτῷ τῷ ὄντι
 δόντι, καὶ ἐν δαδύρα χώρα ἔχοντι, πνεῦμα τὸ τὸ πνευμα-
 τικὸν τῷ, ἐπὶ μὴ λόγῳ πμῶν ἀποδείξομεν.

St. de Sp. S. c. 39 p. 359. D. Εὐδοξοῖ τοῖς πατέρας ἡμῶν μὴ σατῶ
 ειν τῷ ἐπισκευῇ φωτὸς δι' ἡμῶν. ἀλλ' εἰδὺς φαίνετο εὐχαρι-
 καὶ ὅτι μὴ ὁ πατὴρ τὸ φημῶν ἐκείνων τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εὐχαριστοῦ,
 οὐκ ἔχοντες. ὁ μὴ πῶς λαοὶ ἀρχαῖαν ἀρίστην τῶν φωνῶν, καὶ εὐ-

24 *The Personality and Divinity*

which *always* made a Part of their Evening-Serv
and which is *at this Time* Used by the Greek Church
In that Prayer, the Holy Ghost is join'd with the
ther and Son: And as to the Antiquity of its Com
fition, St. Basil appealing to it as a *very Old Form*,
Constant and Receiv'd Use in the Church, and Th
Long, that it could not in *His Time* be known W
was that Compos'd it, It may not *Unfitly* be refer
the *First and Earliest Times* of Christianity. Such
other Form, in which the Holy Ghost is join'd
the Father and Son, is that Doxology, so frequently U
in our Liturgy, and term'd *Gloria Patri*; For the
of which, St. Basil, in the ^a Place above-cited, app
to no fewer than *Seven Fathers* of the Church,
All liv'd before the Council of Nice. And, no
trouble You with any More; Such another is that
Seraphick Hymn Us'd in Our Office of the Commu
which begins with these Words, *Glory be to God on H*
which Hymn *must be Ante-Nicene*; because 'tis appe
to by ^b Athanasius as of Receiv'd Use in *His Time*;
found in the ^c *Alexandrian MS.* of the Bible as
James's, which Manuscript is Coeval^d with the Cou
of Nice; and Lastly, because, by a great ^e Cloud of
thors of the *Middle Ages* of the Church, (such as W
frid Strabo, Rabanus Maurus, Alcuin, and Others) it is
versally affirm'd to have been made a Part of the C
ὁ δὲ πῶς ποτὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκινῶνται αἱ λέγοντες αὐτοὺς Πατέρες,
ὡς ἔχον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ. This Prayer Dr. Smith, (*Account of the*
Church, p. 229. Lond. 1680) with great Probability, supposes
the same with that which is as this time us'd by the Greek Church
and call'd *ὡς ἔστι τῷ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπῳ*.

^a Basil. Ibid. p. 358. 399, and 366. cites Clemens Romanus,
the two Dionysii, Athenogenes. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and
million. ^b Athanas. de Virgin. p. 122. B. Vol. 2d. Paris 1698. ^c
Treatise is Doubtless of *Very Great Antiquity*. if not *His* whose
it bears. ^d Dr Smith, ubi Sup. p. 225. ^e Dr Grahe's Spicil.
Vol. 1. p. 261. Oxon. 1714. ^f See Rabanus Maurus de Inst. Ch.
r. c. 12. p. 318. Ed. Cologne 1568. Anastasius Bibl. in Vit. Teo.
4. Paris 1649. Walafrid Strabo de Reb. Eccles. C. 22. p. 959. G.
in Bib. Pat. Tom. 9. Cologne 1618. Amularius Fortunatus L.
Off. Eccles. c. 8. p. 182. Cologne 1568. Alcuinus de Divin. O.
78. Cologne 1568. Add to all this, that Dr. Smith, Ibid. supposes
Hymn to have been the *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ* of the Christians
Lucian takes Notice of.

tion-Office by *Telephorus* Bishop of Rome, about the
of Christ CXL. And This may Suffice for Proof of
Fourth Argument for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost
Antiquity, taken from the Divine Worship, which
paid Him in the *First* Ages of Christianity.

proceed to my *Fifth* and *Last* Argument; which is
aying before You some of the Chief of the Passages of
Fathers, in which They do in *Express Words* assert
Divinity, by bestowing on Him the Name of God.

Thus *Athenagoras* refutes that Calumny thrown on
Christians, that they were *Atheists*, by saying;
Who would not Wonder to hear Them call'd Atheists, who
in the Father to be God, the Son God, and the Holy

2. From which Passage I thus argue; If the Chri-
s of that Age *did* believe the Father, Son and Spirit
e *One God*, No Answer *could* be return'd that more
ngly refutes the Slander thrown on Them; But if

ey did *not* hold the Son and Spirit to be *God*; No-
g can be more Absurd, than for *Athenagoras*, in a
e where He is Proving that the Christians believ'd
he *True God*, to join *Their* Names with the Father,

on alone They acknowledg'd to Be the *True God*:
e Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost were not the
w'd and Receiv'd Doctrine of the Christians, the
ealing to their Belief on Them, as a sufficient Proof

eir not being *Atheists*, is a way of Arguing *too ap-
ately* Inconclusive to have escap'd a *Philosopher*.
Origen, in more Places than ^b One, speaking of the
tion of the World, asserts, that God, creating it by

Word and *His Wisdom*, (by which he *always* under-
s His Son and Spirit) created it by *Himself*; Than
h *Nothing* can more plainly show, that He thought
Three to be *One God*. At another ^c Place, under

Origen, Legat. p. 11. Col. 1686. *περὶ οὗκ ἐκρήσας λέγονται Θεὸς*
ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον -- αὐτοὺς Ἀδύναμι καὶ αὐτὸν

Origen L. 2. C. 55. p. 185. Hic Pater, Hic Deus, Hic Con-
Hic Factor, Hic Fabricator, qui fecit ea per Semetipsum, hoc
er Verbum & Sapientiam suam. And L. 4. C. 37. p. 330. hav-
id that the Father created all Things by his Word and Spirit,

ds, Ipse a Semetipso Substantiam Creaturarum accipiens.
tem. L. 5. C. 18. p. 427. Unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est
Omnia, & per Omnia, & in Omnibus. Super omnia quidem
per Omnia autem Verbum, — in Omnibus autem
s Spiritus.

26 The Personality and Divinity

the One God who is above All, and through All, and in He comprehends the Son and Spirit with the Father. And were there no other Place in this Excellent Work that might be urg'd to this Purpose, That remarkable Passage in the ^a Twelfth Chapter of His Fifth Book must, by Impartial Judges, be esteem'd sufficient Evidence of the Author's Judgment: There the Venerable Father establishes This Difference between the Spirit of God, and that Spirit which makes Man a living Creature; namely, that the Latter is a Created Being, the Former the Creator of it; the One Temporal, the Other Eternal.

Clement of Alexandria, having severally recited the Names of the Three Persons, calls them jointly by the Name *ἑν*, One in all Respects. And in another ^c Place, discoursing of the Descent of the Spirit on Christ at Baptism, He has This Expression; *Non licet Homini, Columbae similitudinem Deus assumpsit.* Words so plain need no Comment.

Tertullian ^a calls the Advice which St. Paul gives in relation to Matrimony as the Suggestion of the Holy Ghost, the Advice of the Divinity. His Words are these; *Quum veniam nubendi facit (Paulus) Homini, dentis consilium allegat: Quum Continentiam indicit, Spiritus sancti Consilium affirmat: Tertullian's Advice follows in the next Words: Sequere admonitionem cui Divinitus patrocinatur.*

In his Book concerning ^c Baptism, speaking of the excellency of Water, He says, that it did, even before the creation of the World *penes Deum quiescere, & deus vetusaculum Deo subicere*: And for This cites that of Moses, *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters.* Here the Spirit is Twice in express Terms ascribed to God. Indeed in another Part of his Works, He gives quite contrary Exposition of this Text; yet still Deifies Himself in such a manner as to call the Holy Spirit

^a Idem. L. 5 c. 12. p. 415, 416. Aliud est afflatus Vitæ &c. mens. Pæd. L. 3. c. 12. p. 266. *Παρά* here I take Adverbially, often signifies in Sacred, as well as Profane Authors. See 1 Cor. 33. and Homer. Od. N. ver. 209. And Sylburgius's Version of Words by *Qui unus est Omnia*, does not seem to me to make Sense. ^c Clemens in the Catena on Luke 3. 22. in p. 1013. Potter's Clemens Ed. Oxon. 1715. ^d Tertullian de Exh. Cal. p. 667 & L. de Bap. c. 3. p. 256. B.

Words I refer to are in His Book against ^a *Hermogenem*; *eum Spiritum Conditum ostendens, qui in Terras Con-*
deputabatur, qui super aquas ferebatur.-----Non, ut
dam putant, ipsum Deum significari Spiritum, quia De-
spiritus: Non enim Aqua Dominum sustinere sufficerent;
um Spiritum dicit, de quo etiam Venti constiterunt.
 Which of These Interpretations is the True One, con-
 s not me to Enquire; it sufficiently Answering my
 ent Purpose, that the Author in Both Places calls the
 y Spirit God.

In the Book de ^b *Carne Christi*, He argues, That the
 of God is Therefore God and Born of God, because
 otten by the Spirit of God, which Spirit is God.
 at ^c another Place; He affirms, that the Father,
 and Spirit are a Trinity in One Godhead.
 were an almost endless Work to transcribe from Ter-
 as many Passages as might be produc'd to This
 pose; Let it suffice that I lay before you a Few
 ch One only of his Books, (I mean That against
 eas) furnishes Us with. In That Treatise He as-
 s, That the Father, Son and Spirit are ^d *One, per sub-*
stantia Unitatem: that They are, ^e *Tres unius Substantia*:
 t, the Son and Holy Spirit are ^f *Consortes Substan-*
tiæ Patris: That ^g *the Spirit of God is God, and the Word*
of God is God, because Proceeding from God, yet not that
son] of whom He is: That, ^h *There is One Substance in*
the Coherent Persons: That, ⁱ *the Name of God and Lord*
is to the Father, Son, and Spirit: That, ^k *These Three*
Unum not Unus; as it is said, *I and my Father are One,*
to denote the Unity of Substance, not the singularity
number: That, ^l *They Differ not from Jews, who Be-*
lieve One God, in such a manner as to exclude the Son and
Spirit: That, ^m *'Tis the Design and Substance of the New*
Testament to teach us, That the Father, Son, and Spirit,

Ortullian L. adv. Herm. c. 31. p. 283. B. ^b Idem in E. de Car-
 c. 18. p. 373. D. Cum Ipse sit de Spiritu Dei, & Spiritus Deus
 & Deus ex Deo natus est & ex Carne Hominis Homo in Carne
 natus. ^c Idem in Lib. de Pudicit. c. 21. p. 744. A. In quo est
 as Unius Divinitatis, Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus. ^d Ter-
 adv. Prax. c. 2. p. 635. C. Paris 1634. ^e Ibid. c. 2. p. 635. C.
 c. 3. p. 636. B. ^g Id. Ibid. c. 26. p. 658. C. ^h Id. Ibid. c. 12.
 D. ⁱ Id. c. 13. p. 645. A. ^k Id. c. 25. p. 657. C. ^l Id. c. 31.
 B. ^m Id. c. 31. p. 663. B.

28 *The Personality and Divinity*

being Three [Persons] make One God: And more plain yet, (if any Thing can be more plain) * Two Gods, He, or Two Lords, We never assert; Not that the Father is not God, the Son God, and the Holy Spirit God, and of them God. Expressions more full than These are to be met with, even in those Fathers that liv'd at the Council of Nice.

But before I go on to show the Opinions of Others; I cannot but take Notice of an Objection that may be made to these Passages of *Tertullian*, (as well as the Other Writers already Produc'd) wherein the Holy Ghost is Barely stil'd God. For, it seems, our Adversaries won't allow This as an Argument for the Personality of the Son or Spirit; Because it does not certainly appear, that the word God when ascrib'd to Either of These Persons, has the same signification as when ascrib'd to the Father. But in answer to This, let the Obvious Remark have its due Consideration: The great business of Christianity, at its First Appearing, was to Combat Polytheism; to make Men return to the Worship of the One True God; and to Banish from the Earth the Multitude of False Deities, which the Superstition of the Heathens had Form'd and Introduc'd. If This was what the first Planters of Christianity were Chiefly apply Themselves to; let any one Judge, whether This could be so Abominably absurd, as to bestow the Name of God on the Son and Holy Ghost, if They had thought Them to be truly God. Would This be Reproaching Polytheism? Would not This be to introduce a Fact, what in Words They so earnestly Oppos'd? Would not This be in Truth to own Themselves Guilty of what They charg'd as a Crime on the Gentile-World, namely the Reputing as God, what they knew not to be? Would not This be Putting it in their Adversaries Power to Retort on Themselves their Own Arguments? — We therefore the Fathers call these Two Persons God, This must be Understood to esteem Them God in the proper sense of that Word; Unless We suppose Them to be Inconsistently with Themselves; to Prevaricate with the World; and instead of Directing Men to the Knowledge of the One true God, to confirm Them in Worshipping

Ones, by bestowing that Title on Two Persons, from at the same Time They knew not to be Truly and properly God. But this by the way.

Cyprian treads in the steps of His Master Tertullian; proving the Validity of Heretical-Baptism by This Argument; If says ^a He, any One may receive Baptism from Heretics, He may also receive Remission of sins; If He may receive Remission of sins, He then becomes Sanctify'd and is the Temple of God: But I would know of what God? If you say, of the Creator, (or Father) 'tis not Possible that One who believes not in Him should be a Temple to Him: If you say of Christ; He cannot be a Temple to Him who denies Him God: If you say, of the Holy Spirit; since these Three are One, how can the Holy Spirit be reconcil'd to Him that is Enemy either to the Father or Son? A Testimony This, full to His being God, and that, One God with the Father and Son; that had We no other method of Disproving the Doctrine of the Primitive Church in this controversy, This alone, were sufficient to satisfy us; whether We regard the Clearness of the Words themselves, or the Authority of that Person whose Words they are.

Origen ^b asserts, that the Holy Spirit is join'd with the Father and Son in Honour and Dignity: At other ^c Places he mentions the Godhead of the Adorable Trinity: And, in particular ^d the Godhead of the Holy Ghost.

Gregory of Neocæsarea declares, that the ^e Trinity is One, Undivided in Glory, Eternity and Dominion; That there is Nothing Created, and that it was always One immutable Invariable Trinity. Words, which sufficiently shew their Authors Sentiments to have been, that the three Persons are Consubstantial.

Cyprian. Ep. 73. p. 203. Oxon. 1682. Si Baptizari quis apud hereticos potuit, utique & Remissionem Peccatorum consequi potuit. Peccatorum Remissionem consecutus est, & Sanctificatus est, & Templum Dei factus est. Quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris, non potest cum non credidit. Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potest Templum, qui non agat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti; cum Tres unum sint, modo Spiritus Sanctus placatus ei potest esse, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est? ^b Origen. Proœm. in Lib. Inev. Apoc. & Orig. Comment. on John, apud Basil. de Sp. S. c. 29. p. 359. A. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος θεὸς ἢ ὁ πατήρ & ὁ υἱός. ^c Origen Comment. in Rom. apud Basil. Ibid. 11. πνεῦμα & ὁ υἱός. ^d Gregory in Exp. Fid. p. 1. Τεὶς αὖτε, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀδύνατος ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ μετὰ ὁρίων. — ὅτι ἐν κινήσει ἀλλ' ἀνέπτει & ἀταλλείσθαι ἡ αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτόν. But

30 *The Personality and Divinity*

But why do I dwell on the Assertions of *Private* when We have Evidence enough to the Doctrine of Church, from the Case of *One man only*; I mean *Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria*? When *Sabellius* first appeared that Great man vigorously oppos'd Him; and, as *Atholicks* did, Strenuously maintain'd a *Distinction* of Persons. But, as it often happens to such *Warm Disputants* through a too vehement Desire of evincing that Truth He push'd His Arguments too far; and let fall some guarded Expressions, which seem'd to Intimate a Difference in the *Essence* as well as a *Distinction* of Persons. This Doctrine gave *Universal Offence*; and some *Bishop of Pentapolis* complain'd of Him, as *Heterodox*, to the *Bishop of Rome*; by Whom He was call'd on to vindicate Himself, and explain His Opinion. *Athanasius* indeed, in a set ^a Discourse, has with much Pains shew'd that This his Predecessor was *not* Erroneous in his Faith; but that He held the Divine Essence to be *Indivisibly One* in the Three Persons. If He were Innocent, (as without Doubt He was) He adds One *Eminent Person* to our Number; If He were *not*, yet This is an *Invincible Proof*, that a Difference of the *Essence* was Then look'd on by the Church as an *Heretical Opinion*; and Consequently, that the Father and Holy Ghost's *Consubstantiality* with the Father is the *Received and Catholick Doctrine*.

I hope I have said enough to show, that the Doctrine of Our Church, with regard to the Holy Ghost, is Every Part Conformable to the Christian Church of the three first Centuries. But, I shall take Leave not to dismiss this Subject, 'till I have Prov'd, that the Fathers of those Ages, to which my enquiry is confin'd, believ'd the Divine Essence, (in which it now appears to be held the Holy Ghost to be a *Person*) to have been an *One* as we strictly and properly call an *Individual Numerical Essence*. And This I do, because it imports Their Belief of the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghost beyond all Question; (It being *Impossible* there should be any Inequality in Persons of One *Numerical Essence*) but also; because it wipes off a Slander thrown on the Writings of the Fathers, charging Them with saying, that the Divine Essence is a *Specifically One*, that the Persons of the Father, Son and Spirit

^a Vid. Athanas. de Sentent. Dionysii.

wise One God, than as Three Men, or Three Individuals of any Species, may be said to be of One Essence, having One Common Specific Essence.

could not be thought, that so many Pious and Learned men of all Communion, as profess a great Reverence for the Writings of those Primitive Fathers, would sit silent under so heavy a Reprach, and so publicly thrown on them as downright 'Tritheism; For a Specific Unity is more than Tritheism. What Curcellaus therefore had added to 'This purpose, Our Excellent Bishop ^a Stillingfleet, with His Usual Solidity and Learning, refute. because the Celebrated Mons. le-Clerc, (without taking Notice of Bishop Stillingfleet's Answer) has in ^b Plain terms, and with more Confidence, (with a Confidence, I may venture to say, Peculiar to Himself) repeated the charge, and insinuated the Impossibility of shewing it to be a Falshood; It will, I presume, be Judg'd not altogether Foreign to my Subject, if I produce a few Reasons to show, that the Divine Essence was then, as it is now, understood to be, what we commonly call a Numerical One.

One of the most Venerable Assemblies of Christians before the Council of Nice, was the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata. That crafty Heretick well known to have deny'd the Divinity of the Son of God. And when some of the Orthodox Bishops had declared Him to be *Consubstantial* with His Father; Paul, ^c Stillingfleet's Vind. of the Trin. p. 76. ^b See Le-Clerc's Suppl. Hammond's Annot. on 1 John 5. 6. where He says, (p. 622. 1699 4to) that the Fathers affirm'd the Persons to be, properly speaking, Three Consubstantial Gods. ^c Athanasius de Syn. Arim. lib. 1. p. 759. A. Ed. Paris 1698. reconciles the Councils of Antioch and Nice (the Former of which had declin'd, the Latter establish'd the Word Ομοούσιον,) thus. Οἱ Σαμοσατίται καὶ διόλοντες τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς πατρὸς, καὶ λέγοντες, οὐκ εἶναι ἕνα θεόν, ἀλλ' εἶναι τρεῖς θεοὺς οὐκ ἔν ὁμοούσιον ἐστὶ τῆς πατρὸς, καὶ ἀνάγκη τρεῖς θεοὺς εἶναι, μίαν μὲν προσηγορίαν, τὰς δὲ δύο ἐξ ἐκείνης. ὡς πάλιν, εὐλαβηθέντες τὸ πιστὸν σύστημα Σαμοσατίτης, οὐκ εἶναι ἑν θεόν ὁμοούσιον. οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕν ὡς ἕν θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκείνῳ ἐνός. Οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἀρμενικὴν ἀρεσκὴν ἀναδιαμαρτυροῦντες τὴν πανουργίαν τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἔπαινον καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀσωμάτων, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ Θεῷ τῷ Ομοούσιῳ, μωρολογούντες τὸ οὐκ ὡς ἑτεροθεοὺς ὡς περὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκείνῳ ἐνός ἐστὶ τῆς πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀπὸ πατρὸς, — τὸν ἐν ἑκείνῳ εἰρήνηται καὶ ἀπὸ Ομοούσιον (under-

32 *The Personality and Divinity*

(understanding that Word in the sense in which apply'd to Corporeal and Finite Beings) urg'd against the Use of it, that It made the *Three Persons* to be *Three Distinct Substances*: By which questionless He meant that the Word *Ομοιότης* cannot properly be apply'd to *Persons* in *One Individual Substance*; but supposes a *Difference or Division* of the Substance, as is, for instance, among the *Individuals* which constitute a *Species*. This then is the Time when these Fathers must speak and Here 'tis They must declare what sort of *Unity of Substance* they asserted in the Godhead. The Evidence sufficiently shows Their Doctrine; For, rather than the least suspicion of Their holding Them to be *Substantial* in that sense which Paul had fix'd on the Word, They chose wholly to Decline and Forbid the Use of a Significant and Discriminating a Word as *Ομοιότης*. They held the Divine Unity to be such as we call a *Specific Unity*, They would then certainly have Established the Use of that Word, for that very Reason which gave against it: For, No men, that believ'd the Nature such, as Necessarily makes Them *Three Distinct Substances* (as a *Specific Unity* apparently does) can be conceived as so absurdly, as to reject the Use of a word, for any other Reason than its seeming to Declare Them to be *Three Distinct Substances*. It's Evident then, that the Council, compos'd of the most Eminent Bishops of that Age, did not believe a *Specific Unity*; since They rejected a Word, (than which None could be of more use) against the Heretick whom They met to Condemn, because it seem'd to Countenance that Opinion; or might by Weak Men be Understood so to do.

My Second Argument shall be This: It's a matter of Fact too well known to need any Proof, that in the Ages of the Church, there was no greater Obstacle to the Reception of the Christian Religion, than the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; because of the Appearance they made toward Introducing *Polytheism*. The strength of the Objection lay in This; that a Plurality of Persons must infer a Plurality of Gods; Or, (which is the same Thing) that *Three Distinct Persons* must Destroy

^a Thus Lucian ridicules the Christian Trinity. vol. 2d. p. 10. Amst. 1687. And the same Difficulty plung'd Noetus, Praxeas, Sabellius into their Heresies.

inconsistent with, the Unity of the Godhead. But to
 Unity could *This* be Objected? To a *Specific*
 Surely, the Heathens were *not* so *weak* Reasoners,
 assert *That*: And they could not but know, that in
 an Unity, there may be not only *Three*, but *any* the
best Number of Persons. The Christians were de-
 to Reconcile *Three* Persons with *One* Essence; a
 tion, which could *never* have been *Ask'd*; than
Nothing can be easier to *Resolve*; and to which
Others could not have fail'd to have returned that *Plain*
Obvious Answer, had *They* held the Unity of the
 head to be *Specific*: On the contrary, we find,
 They never *endeavour'd* to solve it by *That* way;
 whose such *Other* methods of Explaining it, as ren-
 it a very *Difficult* matter. They were charg'd
 the Heathens and Sabellians as Introducers of *Tritheism*;
 charge, to which They must have pleaded *Guilty*,
 evidently They *were*) if They had held a *Specific*
 ; but we find, They *Universally* denied the *Accu-*
 , profess'd the *greatest* Detestation of *Polytheism*,
 endeavour'd to reconcile *Three* Persons with *One*
 ce by *Other* methods. And as 'tis *Thus* Evident,
 the seeming Inconsistency of *Three* Persons with
 Essence, could *never*, with any Colour of Reason or
 , be made an Objection against the Trinity, if the
 tians had maintain'd a *Specific* Unity; so, if we
 se them to have held a *Numerical* One, we shall find
 Reason to wonder at *That* Objection to the Doctrine;
 the seeming *Contradiction* imply'd by *Three* *Distinct*
 ns in *One* *Individual* Godhead, is the *very* same er-
 us Plea with that of the *modern* Antitrinitarians.

last Argument, to Prove that the *Ante-Nicene* Fa-
 did not hold this Unity to be a *Specific* One,
 be taken from their asserting it to be *One* in *such* a
 er as to be *Incapable* of *Division*: from whence it
 ably follows, that They *must* have understood it to
Numerical Essence; because 'tis by *all* men *confess'd*,
Specific Essence, when there are *several* *Indi-*
 s under it, is an *Actually-Divided* Essence: If then
 maintain'd the Divine Nature to be *Indivisibly* *One*,

Terullian adv. Prax. c. 13. Novatian de Trin. c. 30
 Praxius L. 4. c. 19.

34 *The Personality and Divinity*

(as I doubt not but I shall show They did) we charge them with holding a *Specific* Unity, unless suppose Them so grossly stupid, as to maintain this Contradiction, namely, that the Divine Essence is *capable of Division*, and yet *actually-Divided*. That held the Divine Nature to be *Incapable of Division*, the following Evidences, *Clement of Alexandria* speaks of God, says, ^a *There are no Parts in him, as being indivisible*, an *Indivisible One*. *Origen* ridicules the *icks*, because They could not discover the Nature of God. It being ^b *Simple, Uncompounded, Indivisible*. *Lactantius* holds that the Divinity ^c *nec minui nec Dividi potest*. And, to mention any more, we find by the Citations which *Athanasius* makes from the two *Dionysii*, the *Cotemporary Bishops of Rome and Alexandria*, that They express'd the greatest Detestation of an Opinion at that Time advanced that the Divine Essence is *Divided in the Persons*.

In Conformity with this Principle, the Fathers *universally* declare, that the Generation of the Son, and Procession of the Spirit, caus'd no Division in the Divine Nature; but that the Persons, as to the Essence, continue *Inseparable* from each Other. Can This be affirmed of Persons in a *Specific* Nature? Can it be truly said that the *Individuals* of a *Species* are *Inseparable* from each other? The least knowledge in *Philosophy* discovers that it cannot. *Justin* & *Martyr* calls the Son *Undivided and Indivisible* from the Father: And that the Word begotten *not by Division*, is affirm'd by both ^d *Justin* & his Scholar ^e *Tatian*. Upon the same Account is *Cicero's* ^f *Inseparatos ab alterutro Patrem & Filium* & *Origen's* *ritum testor*; and, that the Three Persons ^g *Numquam Divisione patiuntur*. Hence it is, that by *Athenagoras* He is term'd ^h *Undivided from God*: By *Clement of Alexandria*

^a *Clement. Strom.* 5. p. 587. *De Colugn.* 1698. ^b *Origen. Cels. L. 4. p. 169.* *Ὁὐδὲν ἰσχυρῶς ἐν τῷ ὁρισμῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἵκναι, οἷον ὡς εἰς ἀπείρητον, καὶ ἀπείρητον, καὶ ἀπείρητον, καὶ ἀπείρητον.* ^c *Lactantius de Ira Dei, c. 11. p. 739. Oxon. 1684.* ^d See the Citations in p. 234. and 236. of *Bp. Bull's Def. Fid. Nic.* Edit. Ox. ^e *Justin. Dial. p. 353 B. Col. 1686.* *Ἀπείρητον καὶ ἀχρόνιον ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς.* ^f *Justin. Ib. p. 284.* *Ἀπείρητον καὶ ἀχρόνιον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς.* ^g *Exemplum &c. g. Tatian Orat. p. 145. B.* (ad cal. Justin) says of the Son, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, &c.* ^h *Tertul. adv. Prax. p. 640. A. i. Tertul. Ib. c. 2. p. 635. C.* ^k *Athenagoras Legat. p. 11. (ad cal. Justin.) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀμείστος.*

more than Once, ^a *Undivided and Inseparable from* Father. Hence does ^b *Dionysius of Alexandria* term Persons *Undivided and Indivisible*: Hence does *Dionysius of Rome* so sharply rebuke Those who asserted *Three* Persons. Hence *Tertullian's* ^c *Prolatum dicimus* *a Patre, sed non separatim*; and at another Place, *Pater & Filius Duo, & hoc non ex separatione substantiæ— Individuum & Inseparatum Filium a Patre pronunciamus*. And lastly, Hence *Lactantius* in *Express* words, that the ^e *Son is not separate from the Father*. This they endeavour'd Faintly to represent to our Understanding, by the Production of a Ray from the Sun, a Stream from a Spring, Fruit from a Tree, and the like, as if One Flame of Fire from Another. Illustrations Us'd by the First ^f *Writers* on this Subject; and which they aim'd to give Us some Notion, (though necessarily an *Inadequate* One) how the Persons may be *Distinct*, and yet the Essence continue *Indivisible*. Then is the *Sum* of the Argument: A *Specific* Nature is on all hands allow'd to be a *Divided* Nature; with these Writers, the Divine Essence is so far from being *Divided*, that 'tis *Incapable of Division*: In a *Specific* Essence the Persons are undeniably *separate*; But in the Divine, the Divine Persons neither are nor can be separated. And this Argument will receive further Strength and Weight, if a late Observation of a very Learned Author, (whose thorough Acquaintance with the Writings of the Fathers very well enabled Him to make such Judgment) be found to be *Just*; And that is, that the words *ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀμείβεσθαι, ἀδίδασκεν*, and the like, which we rightly render by *Indivisible*, do, in the Language of the Fathers, (when words had not so Determin'd a sense as with Us they have) signify what we now call by *Numerical*. If this be true; all these Passages

^a Alex. Strom. 7. p. 702, 703. ^b *ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀμείβεσθαι, ἀδίδασκεν*. 790. he says the Son is in the Bosom of the Father *ἀδίδασκεν*. ^c See Bishop Bull ubi sup. ^d Tertull. ad. Prax. 639. D. ^e Tertull. Ibid. c. 19 p. 651. B. vid. & p. 639. C. ^f A. ^g Lactantius L. 4. c. 29. p. 404. Quoniam Patri fidelis est, non separatur; sicut nec rivus a fonte, &c. ^h See Justin Dial. p. 284, and 358. Tatian Orat. p. 145. Athenagoras. p. 10. Tertullian Apol. c. 25. and L. adv. Prax. c. 8. 13. 22. and Irenaeus L. 4. c. 19. p. 403. ⁱ Mr. Wall. Hist. of Inf. Bap. vol. 1. 16. Ed. Lond. 1705.

36 *The Personality and Divinity*

I have produc'd, wherein the Nature of God is to be *Indivisible*, and the Persons of that Essence to be *separable* from each other, are as point-blank Testimonies to the *Numerical Unity*, as if the very word had been us'd by these Authors.

I have now finish'd what I propos'd; and from Scripture that the Holy Ghost is a Person, He is a Person *Distinct from*, and yet in the same *essence with*, the Father and Son. From Antiquity have evinc'd, that the *Ante-Nicene Church* asserted, He is a Person; that He is a Person *Distinct from* other Two; that He is in the same *Essence with* other Two; and that the *Essence* in which they are, what in *strictness of Language* we call a *Numerical*. This, I hope, has been *fully made out*; And more this, I presume, *needs not* be made out.

It has of late been complain'd of, (I know not *justly*) by the Favourers and Patrons of the *Opposite* *Ermine*, that the Treatment they now adays meet in the Writings of their Adversaries has been such, is more likely to *Provoke* than *Persuade*, and to *confirm* them in their Notions, than to make them *renounce*. They cannot indeed be enough condemn'd, any such Controversial Writers (there be) who, by their Heat to hurry them into *Indecencies*. To *Rebate* is not the way to *Convince*; and when a *Case* can be wrought by a light and gentle *Touch*, no *Force* can be made for *that Hand*, which by a *Painful* *Afflictive* treatment *racks* its Patient. We ought rather to lament, that our Adversaries in *this Controversy* are, of *all Others*, the most *subtile* and the most *industrious*; that while all other Dissenters from our *Established* Tenets, are, for the most part, Men of *Ordinary* *Learning* and Art; *These only* recommend the most *pernicious* Doctrines, by a *fair shew* of Reason and Knowledge. *These* propagate Error, the most *nauseous* Drug, under a gilded Surface; and set off and varnish, with the gloss of worldly Wisdom, Positions destructive of our *Christian* Religion. *This at least must* be allow'd them; And the proper Use that *We* are to make of it, is, to apply ourselves with a *double* Portion of Diligence, in our guard against a Danger, to which the Passage is *easy* to *Smooth* and *Inviting*.

F. I. N. I. S.

